

Comments on Points Raised by Senator J. W. Fulbright in his
Letter of 31 March 1966 Concerning the George Carver Article
in FOREIGN AFFAIRS Magazine.

PREFACE:

Mr. George Carver has been acquainted with the Director of FOREIGN AFFAIRS, Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong, for some time. In the Fall of 1964, Mr. Armstrong asked Mr. Carver to write an article on the general social and political situation in South Vietnam for publication in the April 1965 issue of FOREIGN AFFAIRS. This article was published under the title "The Real Revolution in South Vietnam". In accordance with standard Agency practice, Mr. Carver's article was reviewed within the Agency before it was submitted to FOREIGN AFFAIRS for publication. Such reviews are conducted for security purposes to insure that an article does not reveal intelligence sources and methods which by law the Director of Central Intelligence is responsible for protecting.

In December 1965, Mr. Armstrong again contacted Mr. Carver, saying that he, as a public service, wanted to run an objective, factual, historical analysis of the Viet Cong movement in the April 1966 issue. Mr. Armstrong personally asked Mr. Carver to write the article. Again in this case, Mr. Carver submitted his article to the Agency for the required security review, and security approval was given.

Agency regulations permit Agency employees to contribute articles for publication subject to Agency security review. Over the years, a number of our employees have published articles. As in the academic field, we have found

that skilled and scholarly analysts of the type so vital to Agency work, find it important to preserve their credentials as scholars by writing and publishing in the field of their specialty. Such publications are approved only if prudence and security prevail.

QUESTIONS

1. "There was no indication of the fact of Carver's CIA employment in the magazine and it would be logical for the reader to assume, therefore, that Mr. Carver was writing for himself and not for the Administration."

COMMENT:

Mr. Carver wrote these articles in his private capacity and any assumption to this affect that a reader might make would be correct. One of the reasons Agency employees writing privately for publication do not indicate their place of employment is to divorce their private views from those of the Agency and to avoid any implication that their views necessarily represent those of the Executive Branch. Mr. Carver's present association with the Agency is overt in nature and no attempt was made on inquiry to withhold or deny this fact. His employment was mentioned in at least one newspaper article commenting on his paper. This Agency was queried by the author of that article and Mr. Carver's employment was acknowledged.

2. "...was Mr. Carver encouraged by the Agency to write this article?"

COMMENT:

Mr. Carver was neither encouraged^{or} or discouraged by the Agency in the writing of his article. The request was put to him directly by Mr. Armstrong.

As noted above, the Agency took the usual prudent step of assuring that security concerns were met.

3. "Did Mr. Carver use information available to him only by reason of his employment?"

COMMENT:

It is not possible to state categorically that Mr. Carver did not use any information available to him only by reason of his employment. However, a preponderance of the material used by Mr. Carver is available to any serious scholar with Mr. Carver's background and the time and ability to spend an extended period of time in Vietnam. It is, of course, possible that some minor portion of the material contained in the article may have been available only by reason of the nature of Mr. Carver's employment.

4. "Did the Agency approve the article?"

COMMENT:

There is a ^{matter} ~~question~~ of definition involved in this question. The Agency did approve the article after determining that it contained no classified information; however, the Agency did not approve the article from the standpoint of content and the article is not an expression of Agency views ^{necessarily} ~~or~~ ^{nor does it necessarily represent} a consensus ^{of} ~~of~~ the views of Agency experts in this field.

5. "Would the Agency have approved the article if it had been critical of Administration policy?"

COMMENT:

The Agency would not approve of any article which explicitly supports or criticizes the Administration. The article in question is considered to be essentially a statement of historical fact. Admittedly, any historical article may have political overtones but the main thrust of this article was historical. The question is moot as to whether the Agency would have approved the article had the implications of historical fact been contrary to the Administration's policy, since such an article would have to stand on its own merit and until a specific article is written it is not possible to say whether it would be approved.

6. "Would Mr. Carver have been free to write a critical article for publication?"

COMMENT:

The freedom of an Agency employee to publish is contingent on Agency approval of the article. Therefore, the answers to the previous paragraph would also pertain to this question.

7. "Why was Mr. Carver's official connection with the Government not made public?"

COMMENT:

In the past it has not been the policy of Agency employees writing for publication to indicate their place of employment. This has not been for the purpose of concealing the nature of the employment but principally to protect the public from giving undue weight to the content of the article based on any misapprehension which might result from an assumption that the author had access to information not generally available or that his article represents a consensus of Agency or Administration views. While we ask our employees not to advertise the fact of their employment, overt employees (such as Mr. Carver) are also instructed not to deny the fact of their employment if specifically queried of this point. Perhaps the time has come when we should instruct employees writing for publication to identify their place of employment. However, it is probable that we would receive as many or more complaints should this be done as we would if we continue as in the past. Should we adopt the position of requesting Agency employees writing for publication to so identify themselves, approval of publication could be granted only if the article clearly stated that it represents the views of the author and not necessarily those of the Agency or the Administration.

8. "How many other Agency employees have written articles in their field of interest for publication in the U. S. without attribution?"

COMMENT:

A number of other Agency employees have written for publication in their fields of technical competence subject only to security clearance by the Agency. These have ranged from articles on scientific and technical matters to economics and history. In some instances, articles have been written in response to specific requests from congressional committees and are published by these committees without attribution to the Agency with full knowledge on their part that the author is employed by the Agency.

9. "How is this kind of activity related to the role of the Agency as an information gathering institution?"

COMMENT:

While the Agency does have collection responsibilities, its primary statutory duty is to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government. Certainly the question of the distinction between an historical treatment of a subject and a foreign policy statement or position which takes into consideration historical developments is subject to different determination by different individuals. We have heretofore found nothing inconsistent with

the Agency's information gathering function and publication of personal articles by Agency employees having stature in their professional fields, even though at least a portion of the information involved might be acquired in some manner related to their work.

We have felt that if we are to continue to attract and retain able, intelligence officers who are essential to the work of this Agency, we must give them -- within the bounds of security limitations -- the same opportunities accorded other persons in private and Government life to publish articles related to their particular fields of professional competence. It is for this same reason that we have endeavored to distinguish between their official and personal views by not attaching to their personal publications the imprimatur of their official Agency relationship.